



ADAM WANG, Bar No. 201233  
LAW OFFICES OF ADAM WANG  
12 South First Street, Suite 613  
San Jose, CA 95113  
Tel: (408) 292-1040  
Fax: (408) 416-0248

Attorney for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR DISTRICT OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

BAO YI YANG, WEI WANG, AND LIANG  
XIAN FU

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SHANGHAI GOURMET, LLC, dba  
SHANGHAI GOURMET, XU LIANG SHEN,  
BO JUAN LIU, and DOES 1-10

Defendants

Case No.: C07-04482 JL

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
DAMAGE AND DEMAND FOR JURY  
TRIAL**

1). Violation of California Labor Code §1194;  
2). Violations of The Fair Labor Standards Act  
(Non-payment of overtime); 3) Failure to  
Provide Meal Period in Violation of Labor Code  
§226.7; 4) "Waiting Time" Penalties under  
California Labor Code §203; 5) For Restitution  
of Unpaid Wages in Violation of California  
Unfair Trade Practices Act under Business and  
Professions Code § 17203; 6) Private Attorney  
General's Act under Labor Code § 2699 & 558;  
and 7) Fraudulent Conveyance under Civil Code  
§ 3439.04 and 3439.05.

Plaintiffs, BAO YI YANG ("YI"), WEI WANG ("WANG"), AND LIANG XIAN FU  
("FU"), for their complaint, allege as follows:

**NATURE OF CLAIM**

1. This is a complaint by former employees against their ex-employer, Defendants  
SHANGHAI GOURMET, LLC dba SHANGHAI GOURMET ("SHANGHAI GOURMET") for  
damages arising out of their employer's failure to pay overtime as required by the Fair Labor  
Standards Act and the California Wage Orders and statutes. The Plaintiffs seek compensatory  
damages for unpaid wages in addition to liquidated damages under Title 29 U.S.C. § 216(b),  
damages under California Labor Code §226.7 for failure to provide meal and rest periods,

1 waiting time penalties under California Labor Code §§ 203, and attorney's fees, costs, and pre  
2 judgment interest pursuant to California Labor Code § 1194(a) and 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

3 Plaintiffs also seek restitution under California Unfair Trade Practices Act under California  
4 Business and Professions Code § 17203.

### 5 **PARTIES**

6 2. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs BAO YI YANG, WEI WANG, AND  
7 LIANG-XIAN FU were individuals resident of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, California,  
8 and were employees of Defendants SHANGHAI GOURMET

9 3. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff FU was an employees of defendant  
10 SHANGHAI GOURMET.

11 4. Defendant SHANGHAI GOURMET, LLC is a California corporation doing  
12 business under a fictitious name SHANGHAI GOURMET in Walnut Creek, California.  
13 According to information and belief, individual defendants XU LIANG SHEN and BO JUAN  
14 LIU, are officers, owners or employees of SHANGHAI GOURMET having control over the  
15 Plaintiffs' work conditions and work situations, and some are sued fictitiously because their  
16 identities are not yet known to the Plaintiffs.

### 17 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

18 5. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs were employees of Defendant SHANGHAI  
19 GOURMET, a restaurant doing business in Contra Costa County, California.

20 6. During the course of Plaintiffs' employment with SHANGHAI GOURMET,  
21 Plaintiffs regularly worked in excess of 8 hours per day and more than 40 hours per week.

22 7. Plaintiffs were paid on a salary basis.

23 8. Plaintiffs did not perform "exempt" duties in their positions as cooks with  
24 SHANGHAI GOURMET and thus were not subject to any exemption under the Fair Labor  
25 Standards Act and California Labor Code.

9. Individual Defendants XU LIANG SHEN and BO JUAN LIU are liable for the  
acts of SHANGHAI GOURMET as the alter egos of SHANGHAI GOURME. Recognition of

the privilege of separate existence would promote injustice because these individual defendants have in bad faith dominated and controlled SHANGHAI GOURMET. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that Defendants XU LIANG SHEN and BO JUAN LIU, have:

- a. Commingled funds and other assets of SHANGHAI GOURMET and their funds and other assets for their own convenience and to assist in evading the payment of obligations;
- b. Diverted funds and other assets of SHANGHAI GOURMET to other than corporate uses;
- c. Treated the assets of the SHANGHAI GOURMET as their own;
- d. Failed to obtain authority to issue shares or to subscribe to issue shares of SHANGHAI GOURMET;
- e. Failed to maintain minutes or adequate corporate records of SHANGHAI GOURMET;
- f. Failed to adequately capitalize or provide any assets to SHANGHAI GOURMET, LLC; and
- g. Diverted assets from SHANGHAI GOURMET to themselves to the detriment of creditors, including Plaintiffs and other employees.

### COUNT ONE

#### *Violation of California Labor Code, Non Payment Of Overtime*

#### *Labor Code §510*

10. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of paragraphs 1-9 as if fully stated herein.

11. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiffs' employment was subject to California Labor Code §§ 1194 and 510, and the applicable Wage Orders promulgated by the California Industrial Welfare Commission pursuant to Labor Code § 1173, which required all employees to be paid overtime for work performed in excess of forty hours per week or eight hours per day,

1 unless specifically exempted by the law.

2 12. During their employment with the Defendants, although Plaintiffs regularly  
3 worked in excess of forty hours per week and in excess of eight hours per day, Plaintiffs received  
4 only straight time from Defendants for these overtime hours.

5 13. During the period that Plaintiffs were employed with Defendants, Defendants  
6 knowingly caused, suffered and permitted Plaintiffs to regularly work in excess of forty hours  
7 per week and eight hours per day without paying Plaintiffs one and one half, or double of  
8 Plaintiffs' regular rate of pay.

9 14. By not paying overtime wages in compliance with the state law, Defendants  
10 violated Plaintiffs' rights under the law, specifically California Labor Code § 1194.

11 15. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay proper wages under  
12 the California Wage Orders, Plaintiffs incurred general damages in the form of lost overtime  
13 wages in the amount to be proved at trial.

14 16. Defendants had been aware of the existence and requirements of the California  
15 Labor Code §§ 510 and 1194 and the Wage Orders, and willfully, knowingly and intentionally  
16 failed to pay Plaintiffs the overtime compensation due to them at the time their employment  
17 ended.

18 17. Plaintiffs were required to retain attorneys for the purpose of bringing this action  
19 and are entitled to an award of attorney's fees and pre-judgment interest pursuant to California  
20 Labor Code § 1194(a).

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth below.

22 **COUNT TWO**

23 *Violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act,*

24 *29 U.S. C. §201, et seq.*

25 18. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of paragraphs 1-17 as if fully  
stated herein.

19. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiffs' employment was subject to the provisions

1 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. § 201, et seq. and the  
2 Plaintiffs were individual employees covered by virtue of their direct engagement in interstate  
3 commerce or in production of goods for commerce or by their employment with Defendants,  
4 who were, at all times relevant, an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods  
5 for commerce as defined by 29 U.S.C. § 203(s).

6 20. FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 207 requires all employees to be paid overtime for work  
7 performed in excess of forty hours per week, unless specifically exempted by the law.

8 21. Although Plaintiffs were not so exempt during their employment with  
9 Defendants, Defendants knowingly caused, suffered, and permitted Plaintiffs to regularly work  
10 in excess of forty hours per week without paying Plaintiffs one and one half of Plaintiffs' regular  
11 rates of pay.

12 22. By not paying overtime wages in compliance with FLSA, Defendants violated  
13 Plaintiffs' rights under FLSA.

14 23. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay proper wages under  
15 the FLSA, Plaintiffs incurred general damages in the form of lost overtime wages in an amount  
16 to be proved at trial.

17 24. Defendants intentionally, with reckless disregard for their responsibilities under  
18 the FLSA, and without good cause, failed to pay Plaintiffs their proper pay, and thus defendants  
19 are liable to Plaintiffs for liquidated damages in an amount equal to their lost overtime wages  
20 pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) of the FLSA.

21 25. Plaintiffs were required to retain attorneys for bringing this action and are entitled  
22 to an award of reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) of the FLSA equal to  
23 their respective lost overtime wages.

24 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth below.

25 **COUNT THREE**

*Failure to Provide Meal/Rest Periods*  
*California Labor Code § 226.7*



1 wages.

2 35. As of this date these wages have not been paid, thus making defendants liable to  
3 Plaintiffs for penalties equal to thirty (30) days wages in an amount to be proved at trial.

4 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth below.

5 **COUNT FIVE**

6 *For Restitution of Unpaid Overtime Wages  
in Violation of California's Unfair Trade Practices Act*

7 *Business and Profession Code § 17203*

8 36. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of paragraphs 1-35 as if  
9 fully stated herein.

10 37. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiffs' employment with Defendants was subject  
11 to California Labor Code and applicable Wage Orders promulgated by the California Industrial  
12 Welfare Commission, which required all employees to be paid overtime for work performed in  
13 excess of forty hours per week or eight hours per day unless specifically exempted by the law.

14 38. At all times relevant herein, defendants were subject to the California Unfair  
15 Trade Practices Act (California Business and Professions Code § §17000 et seq.), but failed to  
16 pay the Plaintiffs overtime pay as required by applicable California Labor Code and applicable  
17 Wage Orders.

18 39. During the period Plaintiffs were employed with the Defendants, Defendants  
19 failed to pay Plaintiffs legally required overtime pay to which they were legally entitled from  
20 Defendants, with Defendants keeping to themselves the amount which should have been paid to  
21 Plaintiffs.

22 40. By doing so, Defendants violated California Unfair Trade Practices Act, Business  
23 and Professions Code §17200, *et seq.* by committing acts prohibited by applicable California  
24 Wage Orders as well as FLSA, and thus giving them a competitive advantage over other  
25



1 employers and businesses with whom defendants were in competition and who were in  
2 compliance with the law.

3 41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' failure to pay the required  
4 overtime pay, the Plaintiffs' rights under the law were violated and the Plaintiffs incurred  
5 general damages in the form of unpaid wages to which they were legally entitled.

6 42. Defendants had been aware of the existence and requirements of the Unfair Trade  
7 Practices Act and the requirements of state and federal wage and hours laws, but willfully,  
8 knowingly, and intentionally failed to pay Plaintiffs overtime pay due.

9 43. Plaintiffs, having been illegally deprived of the overtime pay to which they were  
10 legally entitled, herein seek restitution of such wages pursuant to the Business and Professions  
11 Code §17203.

12 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as set forth below.

13 **COUNT SIX**

14 *Civil Penalty under Labor Code § 558 on Behalf of All Employees*

15 *Labor Code § 2699, et seq.*

16 44. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate the allegations of paragraphs 1-43 as if  
17 fully stated herein.

18 45. Defendants a SHANGHAI GOURMET, XU LIANG SHEN, and BO JUAN LIU  
19 t all times relevant herein are and were subject to California Labor Code §558. California Labor  
20 Code § 558 authorizes to recover as civil penalties for unpaid wages to employees, and fines of  
21 \$50 for each unpaid employee for each pay period for the initial violation and \$100 for each  
22 unpaid employee for each pay period for any subsequent violations. By failing to pay Plaintiffs  
23 overtime due and meal and rest period premiums as alleged herein, Defendants are liable for  
24 penalties prescribed under Labor Code § 558.



1 cash register, and diverted such corporate assets to their personal use without requiring them to  
2 pay adequate consideration.

3 51. Such siphoning of corporate funds had rendered Defendant SHANGHAI  
4 GOURMET insolvent in that Defendant Shanghai Gourmet was left without sufficient funds to  
5 meet its obligation for wages owed to its employees . As such, the diversion of cash proceeds  
6 from Defendant SHANGHAI GOURMET constitutes fraudulent conveyance under California  
7 Civil Code § § 3439.04 and 3439.05.

8 52. Therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to judgment recovering cash amounts diverted  
9 from Defendant SHANGHAI GOURMET to Defendants XU LIANG SHEN and BO JUAN  
10 LIU.

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

12 WHEREFORE, the Plaintiffs pray judgment against the defendants and demand as  
13 follows:

- 14 1. For compensatory damages in unpaid overtime wages;
- 15 2. For liquidated damages equal to unpaid overtime wages owed;
- 16 3. For pre-judgment interest of 10% on the unpaid overtime compensation and unpaid  
17 salaries pursuant to California Labor Code §§ 1194(a) & 218.5.
- 18 4. For additional wages for failure to provide required meal/rest periods as required by  
19 California law together with prejudgment interest of 10% per annum pursuant to California  
20 Labor Code § & 218.6;
- 21 5. For waiting time penalty damages of thirty days wages pursuant to California Labor  
22 Code § 203;
- 23 6. For unpaid overtime and unpaid meal and rest period premiums and other civil  
24 penalties authorized under Labor Code § 558;
- 25 6. For restitution of unpaid overtime pay pursuant to California Business and Professions  
Code §17203;

1 7. For reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to California Labor Code §1194(a), California  
2 Labor Code § 2699(g) and 29 U.S.C. §216(b) of the FLSA.

3 8. For costs of suit herein.

4 9. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem appropriate.

5 Dated:

6 By: /s/ Adam Wang.  
7 Attorney for Plaintiffs

8 BAO YI YANG, WEI WANG, and LIANG XIAN FU  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25